

### REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-9, 18 and 19 have been cancelled, and claims 14, 16 and 26 have been amended. Thus, claims 10-17 and 20-27 are now active in the application.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the kind indication in item 18 that claims 13, 19 and 25 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 18 and 19 have been canceled, and all of the limitations thereof have been added into independent claim 16, to thereby render independent claim 16 allowable in accordance with the indication of allowable subject matter in item 18 on page 5 of the Office Action. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 16, as well as claims 17, 20 and 21 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable.

In items 1-4 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 14, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the limitation "said rotatable shaft" in each of these claims lacked proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, each of these claims have been corrected by changing the claim dependency to a claim having proper antecedent basis for "said rotatable shaft". In particular, claim 14 has been amended to depend from claim 13; claim 20 depends from claim 16 and, since the subject matter of claim 19 has been added into claim 16, proper antecedent basis is provided for "said rotatable shaft" as recited in claim 20; and claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 25. Thus, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

In items 5-17 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 10-12, 16-18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hosoi et al. (U.S. 5,255,154); and claims 15, 21 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosoi et al. These rejections are believed moot with respect the application to claims 16-21, in view of the above incorporation into claim 16 of the allowable subject indicated in item 18 on page 5 of the Office Action. However, these rejections are respectfully traversed as applied to claims 10-12,

15, 22-24 and 27, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested, for the following reasons.

With exemplary reference to the drawing figures, claim 10 sets forth an information terminal comprising: a case 1 having a memory device accommodating section 75 (see Fig. 2) for accommodating a detachable memory device 77; a locking device 13 fixed to the case 1 and being changeable between a locked state and an unlocked state by a lock manipulation part 12, the locking device 13 remaining fixed to the case 1 in both the locked state and the unlocked state; a lid 5, movable between an open state (e.g. Fig. 2) and a closed state (e.g. Fig. 1), for covering the memory device accommodating section 75 and preventing removal of the detachable memory device 77 when in the closed state; and an interlocking lock mechanism (e.g. 17, 63, etc. in Figs. 1-3, and 79 in Fig. 4) operably interlocked with the locking device 13 for retaining the lid 5 in the closed state when the locking device 13 is in the locked state, and for allowing opening of the lid 5 when the locking device 13 is in the unlocked state.

Thus, according to claim 10, the case 1 is required to have a memory device accommodating section 75 for accommodating a detachable memory device 77; and a lid 5 for covering the memory device accommodating section 75 **and preventing removal of the detachable memory device 77 when in the closed state**. Further, claim 10 requires a locking device 13 changeable between a locked state and an unlocked state by a lock manipulation part 12, and an interlocking lock mechanism operably interlocked with the locking device 13 for retaining the lid 5 in the closed state when the locking device 13 is in the locked state, and for allowing opening of the lid 5 when the locking device 13 is in the unlocked state.

In contrast to the present invention of claim 10, the Hosoi et al. patent discloses a portable electronic apparatus having a lid 33, locking devices 39, a lock manipulation part 55, and according to the Examiner, an interlocking lock mechanism 40 operably interlocked with the locking devices 39, but Hosoi et al. does not disclose that the lid 33 covers and prevents removal of a detachable memory device from a memory device accommodating section when in the closed state, as required by claim 10. Although the portable electronic apparatus includes a

floppy disk drive 53 which could be considered a memory device accommodating section, for accommodating a detachable memory device (a floppy disk), the lid 33 does not cover and prevent removal of the floppy disk from the floppy disk drive 53 when in the closed state, as required by claim 10.

Because of these differences, it is submitted that claim 10 is clearly not anticipated by the Hosoi et al. patent. Furthermore, it is submitted that these differences are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly not have been motivated to modify the Hosoi et al. patent in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention of claim 10. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10, as well as claims 11-15 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Next, again with exemplary reference to the drawing figures, independent claim 22 sets forth an information terminal comprising: a case 1 having a memory device accommodating section 75 for accommodating a detachable memory device 77; a power switch 59 mounted to the case 1 for enabling at least one of powering the information terminal on and powering the information terminal off; a locking device 13 mounted to the case and being changeable, by a lock manipulation part 12, between a locked state in which the locking device 13 prevents the power switch 59 from being operated, and an unlocked state in which the locking device 13 allows the power switch 59 to be operated; a lid 5, movable between an open state (e.g. Fig. 2) and a closed state (e.g. Fig. 1), for covering the memory device accommodating section 75 and preventing removal of the detachable memory device 77 from the memory device accommodating section 75 when in the closed state; and an interlocking lock mechanism (e.g. 17, 63, etc. in Figs. 1-3 and 79 in Fig. 4) operably interlocked with the locking device 13 for retaining the lid 5 in the closed state when the locking device 13 is in the locked state, and for allowing opening of the lid 5 when the locking device 13 is in the unlocked state.

Thus, claim 22 specifically requires "a locking device mounted to said case and being changeable, by a lock manipulation part, between a locked state in which said locking device

prevents said power switch from being operated, and an **unlocked state in which said locking device allows said power switch to be operated.**"

In item 12 on page 4 of the Office Action, with reference to claim 22, the Examiner indicated that Hosoi teaches a power switch mounted to the case for enabling at least one of powering the information terminal on and powering the information terminal off because "*inherently, laptop computers have a power switch mounted to the case.*" Although it is true that laptop computers have power switches mounted to their cases, the mere fact of the Hosoi et al. portable electronic apparatus having a power switch does not lead to the conclusion or in any way suggest that the operation of such a power switch in the Hosoi et al. device would be prevented by the locking device 39 or, for that matter, by any locking device.

Accordingly, it is readily apparent that the Hosoi et al. patent does not meet the claim limitation of claim 22 that specifically requires the locking device to be changeable between a **locked state in which said locking device prevents said power switch from being operated**, and an unlocked state in which the locking device allows the power switch to be operated.

Therefore, since this feature of claim 22 is not disclosed in the Hosoi et al. patent, the Hosoi et al. patent clearly does not anticipate claim 22. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Hosoi et al. that would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Hosoi et al. arrangement so as to result in an arrangement in which the power switch is prevented from being operated by a locking device when the locking device is in a locked state, as required by claim 22. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22, as well as claims 23-27 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshiyuki SHIWAKU et al.

By: Charles R. Watts  
Charles R. Watts  
Registration No. 33,142  
Attorney for Applicants

CRW/asd  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 3, 2005